

**REMARKS**

As a preliminary matter, Applicant thanks Examiner Colin for the thoughtful courtesies and kind treatments afforded to Applicant's representative, Michael Fogarty, during the telephonic interview conducted on July 1, 2009. This response reflects the substance of the interview.

During the interview, the Examiner indicated that the instant application will be allowed if claim 1 is amended to include features of claim 2; claim 19 is amended to include features of claim 20; and claims 17 and 18 are canceled. Furthermore, the Examiner requested that claim 6 be amended so that at least one of its elements is explicitly tied to a particular structure and/or a device.

In reliance on the Examiner's indication, claim 1 has been amended to include allowable features of claim 2; claim 19 has been amended to include allowable features of claim 20; and claims 17 and 18 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter. Furthermore, claim 6 has been amended to recite "[a] system for communicating Real Time Protocol voice packets between a local and a remote location over an Internet protocol network, the system including, among other features, a key stream generator device. . ." Support for this amendment may be found in the specification at, for example, page 7, lines 23-28.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that all pending claims are in condition for allowance, an indication of which is solicited.

The Final Office Action objects to the specification of the instant application for the same reason as the one set forth in the Office Action dated October 3, 2008 ("Office Action"). *Compare* Final Office Action at page 4 with Office Action on pages 4, 5. In particular, the Final Office Action again states that the specification fails to provide proper antecedent basis for "a

component used to transmit the Real Time Protocol voice packets changes during the communication session.” The Final Office Action, however, fails to acknowledge Applicant’s response in the Amendment dated April 3, 2009 that this feature at a minimum is supported by the originally filed claims 2 and 3. *See*, Specification at page 12; *See also*, Specification at page 4 (stating a second data stream is generated when the system wishes to switch from a first to a second coder/decoder for compression/decompression of the voice packets).

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection.

Furthermore, in response to Applicant’s arguments, the Office Action states “[w]ithout conceding to applicant’s argument, claims 6 and 13 are also rejected on the same rationale as claim 1 in order to expedite prosecution.” *See*, Office Action at page 3. This is inconsistent with the Examiner’s assertion during the interview and on page 13 of the Final Office Action, indicating that claim 6 is allowed. Applicant also notes that under the § 103 rejection set forth in the Final Office Action, claim 6 is not specifically addressed. Lastly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 6 includes features similar to the allowable features of claim 2. Specifically, claim 6 recites that the key stream generator device produces a second Real Time Protocol key stream for encrypting the voice packets when the system switches from a first communication parameter to a second communication parameter, each of the first and second parameters being involved in the synchronization of the key stream, wherein the first communication parameter is a first coder/decoder that compresses/decompresses the voice packets, and the second communication parameter is a second coder/decoder that compresses/decompresses the voice packets.

For at least the foregoing reasons, claim 6 is believed to be allowable over the cited prior art. If this is not the case, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner notify the Applicant promptly.

Moving forward, the Office Action fails to acknowledge the allowability of claim 20 (now incorporated into claim 19). Applicants respectfully submits that claim 20 is also allowable for several reasons. First, the feature recited in claim 20 is the same as the feature recited in claim 2, which is deemed allowable by the Final Office Action. Second, during the interview, the Examiner specifically stated that claim 19 would be allowed if amended to include features of claim 20. Lastly, the § 103 rejection set forth in the Final Office Action does not address claim 20. For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 19, which incorporates features of claim 20, is allowable over cited prior art.

Based on the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all pending claims are patentable over the cited prior art. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103 be withdrawn.

### **Conclusion**

Having fully responded to all matters raised in the Office Action, Applicant submits that all claims are in condition for allowance, an indication for which is respectfully solicited. If there are any outstanding issues that might be resolved by an interview or an Examiner's amendment, the Examiner is requested to call Applicant's attorney at the telephone number shown below.


To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper,

**Application No.: 09/765,108**

including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 500417 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP

*for*  *Reg No. 53,308*  
Michael E. Fogarty  
Registration No. 36,139

600 13<sup>th</sup> Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20005-3096  
Phone: 202.756.8000 BA:MWE  
Facsimile: 202.756.8087  
**Date: October 9, 2009**

**Please recognize our Customer No. 20277  
as our correspondence address.**